

Atty. Docket No.: CQ10195  
**PATENT APPLICATION**

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No.: 09/733,894

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 and 10-20 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants during the telephonic interview on June 16, 2006. Applicants incorporate into this Amendment the new claims limitations that were discussed during said interview.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Salesky et al., (U.S. patent No. 6,343,313). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of Applicants' amendments to independent claims 1 and 4 and further in view of the following arguments.

Amended claims 1 and 4 generally recite a feature of the invention, wherein the claimed invitation storage memory stores invitation information regarding invitations to join at least one document-centered discussion, which comprises identities of entities invited to join the at least one discussion. This feature of the claimed invention is not taught or suggested by Salesky et al.

In more detail, Salesky et al. describes a conferencing system, which allows conference participants to share all or a portion of the display seen on their computer screens. In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Salesky et al. teaches the claimed invitation storage memory at col. 18 lines 12-26. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants carefully examined the cited portion of Salesky et al. but could not find the alleged teaching. The aforesaid paragraph cited by the Examiner discusses the server, which handles control messages such as a connection request to join a meeting or a message from a client signaling that it is attempting to reconnect to a meeting after losing its connection. Salesky et al. further teaches: "[t]he server accepts

Atty. Docket No.: CQ10195  
**PATENT APPLICATION**

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No.: 09/733,894

connection requests and verifies that the user of the client software is authorized to join the meeting.”

On the other hand, amended independent claims 1 and 4 specifically recite a storage memory storing invitation information comprising identities of entities invited to join the at least one discussion. Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner that the aforesaid portion of Salesky et al., cited by the Examiner, deals not with the claimed invitations issued by the conferencing system to other entities to join the at least one discussion, but with requests issued by the other entities to the conferencing system to join the conference. As the Examiner would appreciate, the aforesaid two concepts are entirely different. Therefore, Salesky et al. fails to teach or suggest the claimed storage memory storing invitation information comprising identities of entities invited to join the at least one discussion.

Moreover, Salesky et al. never mentions that any of the aforesaid control messages relating to conference participants are actually stored on the server. On the other hand, claims 1 and 4 specifically recite an invitation storage memory storing invitation information including identities of entities invited to join the at least one discussion. Therefore, claims 1 and 4 are different from Salesky et al. for this additional reason as well.

In addition, Salesky et al. fails to teach or suggest the view storage memory, which stores view information for each active document-centered discussion, comprising information on each conference participant, which is specifically recited in the amended claims 1 and 4. The Examiner alleges that the aforesaid limitation reads on the conference server storing information regarding scheduled and live presentations, see Office Action at page 2. Applicants respectfully

Atty. Docket No.: CQ10195  
**PATENT APPLICATION**

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No.: 09/733,894

disagree. Specifically, the schedule and live presentation information of Salesky et al. does not include the information on each conference participant. Moreover, claim 4 includes an additional limitation, wherein the information specific to each invitee who has accepted the invitation is stored in the storage memory. This additional limitation is also not taught or suggested by Salesky et al. This provides another reason for patentability of claims 1 and 4 over Salesky et al.

For all the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 4 are not anticipated by Salesky et al. With respect to claims 2-3, 5-6 and 10-20, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 2-3, 5-6 and 10-20 is rendered moot by the present amendment of the parent independent claims 1 and 4, because these claims are patentable by definition, by virtue of their dependence upon the patentable claims 1 and 4.


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Atty. Docket No.: CQ10195  
**PATENT APPLICATION**

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
U.S. Application No.: 09/733,894

Respectfully submitted,

  
Pavel Pogodin  
Registration No. 48,205

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (650) 625-8100  
Facsimile: (650) 625-8110

MOUNTAIN VIEW OFFICE


**23493**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 10, 2006

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 is  
being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office this  
10th day of July, 2006.

  
Monica Moreno